



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,223	08/04/2003	Chris Tengwall	122043/167301	6507

51414 7590 11/13/2007  
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP  
PATENT ADMINISTRATOR  
EXCHANGE PLACE  
BOSTON, MA 02109-2881

EXAMINER

SHERKAT, AREZOO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/13/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

mn

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/634,223	TENGWALL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Arezoo Sherkat	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-80 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-80 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                                  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____   |

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/31/2007 has been entered.

***Response to Amendment***

This office action is responsive to Applicant's amendment received on 10/31/2007. Claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17-20, 22, 23, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 36, 37, 39-41, 71 and 73-75 are amended. Claims 1-80 remain pending.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-80 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The arguments regarding the alleged differences between Little et al. disclosure and the instant application has been explained throughout the rejection.

### ***Drawings***

Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 71 is objected to because of the following informalities: the second appearance of "an arrangement" in line 3 should read as "the arrangement" since it is referring to the same arrangement. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 71 recites the limitation "the relay arrangement" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purpose of examination, Examiner considers "the relay arrangement" to be "the arrangement" referring to "an arrangement" introduced in the second line of the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Little et al., (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0205248 and Little hereinafter).

Regarding claim 24, Little discloses an apparatus to route data for transmission over a wireless carrier network, comprising:

a first arrangement to relay data stored in at least one database and processed by a server arrangement directly to a wireless carrier network for transmission to at least one wireless device, the first arrangement configured to be arranged behind a firewall arrangement that provides security for the data (pages 7-8, par. 65-68), the server arrangement and the first arrangement wherein the first arrangement is configured to push the data from behind the firewall arrangement to the at least one wireless device such that the data is not stored outside the firewall arrangement while enroute to the wireless carrier network (page 8, par. 72-73 and page 9, par. 76-82 - when the VPN router 832 is not available, i.e., when the push-

technique is applied through path 834, the addressing of the mobile device is handled by the wireless infrastructure 810, which is clearly not within the firewall. However, nowhere in the Little it has been disclosed that the data/message is persistently stored outside the firewall before reception by the wireless device. The Fact that the wireless infrastructure 810 locates a given user and tracks users as they roam between networks, at best implies that *it persistently stores routing/addressing information of the users/devices of different wireless networks required for sending each message to the right recipient wireless device*. But it doesn't imply that the data/message, which is to be sent to the wireless device, is persistently stored on the wireless infrastructure 810 outside the firewall arrangement before reception by the wireless device).

Regarding claim 26, Little discloses a system for transmitting data stored in at least one database to at least one wireless device, comprising:

a relay arrangement to route the data directly to a wireless carrier network for transmission over the wireless carrier network, the relay arrangement configured to communicate with the at least one wireless device via a firewall arrangement that provides security for the data and the relay arrangement (pages 7-8, par. 65-68), wherein the relay arrangement is configured to push the data from behind the firewall arrangement to the at least one wireless such that the data is not stored outside the firewall arrangement while enroute to the wireless carrier network (page 8, par. 72-73 and page 9, par. 76-82 - when the VPN router 832 is not available, i.e.,

when the push-technique is applied through path 834, the addressing of the mobile device is handled by the wireless infrastructure 810, which is clearly not within the firewall. However, nowhere in the Little it has been disclosed that the data/message is persistently stored outside the firewall before reception by the wireless device.

The Fact that the wireless infrastructure 810 locates a given user and tracks users as they roam between networks, at best implies that *it persistently stores routing/addressing information of the users/devices of different wireless networks required for sending each message to the right recipient wireless device*. But it doesn't imply that the data/message, which is to be sent to the wireless device, is persistently stored on the wireless infrastructure 810 outside the firewall arrangement before reception by the wireless device).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 9-18, 22-23, 25, and 27-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little et al., (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0205248 and Little hereinafter), in view of Forman, (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0120733).

Regarding claims 1 and 55, Little discloses a system for transmitting data stored in at least one database and processed by a server arrangement to at least one wireless device (i.e., mobile device 816 and 818) that receives data from a wireless carrier network (i.e., wireless networks 812 and 814), the system comprising:

at least one relay arrangement (i.e., wireless connector system 828) for routing the data to the wireless carrier network (i.e., wireless networks 812 and 814) for transmission over the wireless carrier network to at least one wireless device (i.e., mobile device 816 and 818), and a firewall arrangement (i.e., firewall 808) that provides security for the data, the server arrangement (i.e., message server 820) and each relay arrangement (page 7, par. 64), wherein each relay arrangement (i.e., wireless connector system 828) is arranged behind the firewall arrangement and is configured to push the data from behind the firewall arrangement to the at least one wireless device (page 7-8, par. 67 and page 9, par. 76-82 – wherein the wireless connector system 828 and the message server 820, both clearly protected within the firewall, are designed to cooperate and interact to allow pushing of the information to mobile devices 816, 818).

Little does not explicitly disclose that the data is only transmitted when the at least one relay arrangement determines that the at least one wireless device can receive the data.

However, Forman discloses an email server system that manages the status of every email address registered in and managed by the email server system



before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claim 10, Little discloses a method for transmitting data, comprising:

retrieving data via a server arrangement (i.e., message server 820), processing the data in the server arrangement, sending the data to a relay arrangement arranged behind a firewall arrangement and processing the data in the relay arrangement (i.e. wireless connector system 828), and routing the data to the at least one wireless carrier network for transmission to at least one wireless device, the data being pushed from the relay arrangement from behind the firewall arrangement to the at least one wireless device, the firewall arrangement providing

security for the data, the server arrangement and the relay arrangement (page 7-8, par. 67 – wherein the wireless connector system 828 and the message server 820, both clearly protected within the firewall, are designed to cooperate and interact to allow pushing of the information to mobile devices 816, 818).

receiving the data at the at least one wireless carrier network (i.e., any of the wireless networks 812 and 814), processing the data in the at least one wireless carrier network, sending the data to the at least one wireless device, receiving the data at the at least one wireless device, and processing the data in the at least one wireless device (page 8, par. 72), whereby the data is not persistently stored outside the firewall arrangement until reception by the wireless device (page 8, par. 72-73 and page 9, par. 76-82 - As disclosed in par. 73 of Little's disclosure and in light of interview on 10/25/2007, when the VPN router 832 is not available, i.e., when the push-technique is applied through path 834, the addressing of the mobile device is handled by the wireless infrastructure 810, which is clearly not within the firewall. However, nowhere in the Little it has been disclosed that the data/message is persistently stored outside the firewall before reception by the wireless device. The Fact that the wireless infrastructure 810 locates a given user and tracks users as they roam between networks, at best implies that *it persistently stores routing/addressing information of the users/devices of different wireless networks required for sending each message to the right recipient wireless device*. But it doesn't imply that the data/message, which is to be sent to the wireless device, is

persistently stored on the wireless infrastructure 810 outside the firewall arrangement before reception by the wireless device).

Little does not explicitly disclose that the data is only transmitted when the at least one relay arrangement determines that the at least one wireless device can receive the data.

However, Forman discloses an email server system that manages, checks, and verifies the status of every email address registered in and managed by the email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claim 14, Little discloses an apparatus for transmitting data, comprising:

means for processing data, means for pushing the data directly to a wireless carrier network, means for securing the data, the means for processing and the means for pushing, and at least one wireless device that receives data from over the wireless carrier network, wherein the means for pushing is arranged behind the means for securing (i.e., firewall 808), and wherein the means for pushing is configured to push the data to at least one wireless device (page 7-8, par. 67 and page 9, par. 76-82 – wherein the wireless connector system 828 and the message server 820, both clearly protected within the firewall, are designed to cooperate and interact to allow pushing of the information to mobile devices 816, 818), whereby the data is not persistently stored outside the firewall arrangement until reception by the wireless device (page 8, par. 72-73 and page 9, par. 76-82 - when the VPN router 832 is not available, i.e., when the push-technique is applied through path 834, the addressing of the mobile device is handled by the wireless infrastructure 810, which is clearly not within the firewall. However, nowhere in the Little it has been disclosed that the data/message is persistently stored outside the firewall before reception by the wireless device. The Fact that the wireless infrastructure 810 locates a given user and tracks users as they roam between networks, at best implies that *it persistently stores routing/addressing information of the users/devices of different wireless networks required for sending each message to the right recipient wireless device*. But it doesn't imply that the data/message, which is to be sent to the wireless device, is persistently stored on the wireless infrastructure 810 outside the firewall arrangement before reception by the wireless device).

Little does not explicitly disclose that the data is only transmitted when the at least one wireless device can receive the data.

However, Forman discloses an email server system that manages, checks, and verifies the status of every email address registered in and managed by the email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claim 15, Little discloses a system for transmitting data stored in at least one database and processed by a server arrangement to at least one wireless device that receives data from a wireless carrier network, comprising:

at least one relay arrangement for routing the data to the wireless carrier network for transmission to the at least one wireless device, each relay arrangement being arranged within a controlled network and being configured to push the data

from behind a firewall arrangement within the controlled network to the at least one handheld wireless device (page 7-8, par. 67 and page 9, par. 76-82 – wherein the wireless connector system 828 and the message server 820, both clearly protected within the firewall, are designed to cooperate and interact to allow pushing of the information to mobile devices 816, 818), whereby the data is not persistently stored outside the firewall arrangement until reception by the wireless device (page 8, par. 72-73 and page 9, par. 76-82 - when the VPN router 832 is not available, i.e., when the push-technique is applied through path 834, the addressing of the mobile device is handled by the wireless infrastructure 810, which is clearly not within the firewall. However, nowhere in the Little it has been disclosed that the data/message is persistently stored outside the firewall before reception by the wireless device. The Fact that the wireless infrastructure 810 locates a given user and tracks users as they roam between networks, at best implies that *it persistently stores routing/addressing information of the users/devices of different wireless networks required for sending each message to the right recipient wireless device*. But it doesn't imply that the data/message, which is to be sent to the wireless device, is persistently stored on the wireless infrastructure 810 outside the firewall arrangement before reception by the wireless device).

Little does not explicitly disclose that the data is only transmitted when the at least one wireless device can receive the data.

However, Forman discloses an email server system that manages, checks, and verifies the status of every email address registered in and managed by the

email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claim 71, Little discloses An apparatus for transmitting data, comprising:

an arrangement for relaying data to a wireless carrier network (page 7-8, par. 67 and page 9, par. 76-82 – wherein the wireless connector system 828 and the message server 820, both clearly protected within the firewall, are designed to cooperate and interact to allow pushing of the information to mobile devices 816, 818), whereby the data is not persistently stored outside the firewall arrangement until reception by the wireless device (page 8, par. 72-73 and page 9, par. 76-82 - when the VPN router 832 is not available, i.e., when the push-technique is applied through path 834, the addressing of the mobile device is handled by the wireless

infrastructure 810, which is clearly not within the firewall. However, nowhere in the Little it has been disclosed that the data/message is persistently stored outside the firewall before reception by the wireless device. The Fact that the wireless infrastructure 810 locates a given user and tracks users as they roam between networks, at best implies that *it persistently stores routing/addressing information of the users/devices of different wireless networks required for sending each message to the right recipient wireless device*. But it doesn't imply that the data/message, which is to be sent to the wireless device, is persistently stored on the wireless infrastructure 810 outside the firewall arrangement before reception by the wireless device).

Little does not explicitly disclose that the data is only pushed beyond the arrangement to secure the data when the arrangement determines that at least one wireless device that receives data from over the wireless carrier network can receive the data.

However, Forman discloses an email server that manages, checks, and verifies the status of every email address registered in and managed by the email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application



before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claims 2, 11, and 33, Little discloses wherein the data includes at least one of e-mail data and PIM data (page 7, par. 65).

Regarding claims 3, 9, and 13, Little discloses wherein the at least one wireless device receives encryption data wirelessly (pages 8, par. 72).

Regarding claim 4, Little discloses wherein the database includes at least one of an e-mail server (i.e., message server 820) and a database server (i.e., one or more data stores 817)(page 7, par. 66).

Regarding claim 12, Little discloses the method of claim 10, further comprising:

sending encryption data (i.e., through message repackaging technique) to the wireless device via a wireless connection, thus updating operational capabilities of the wireless device (i.e., bulk information updates)(page 3, par. 30-31).

Regarding claim 16, Little discloses wherein the firewall arrangement includes an enterprise firewall arrangement (page 7, par. 65).

Regarding claim 17, Little discloses wherein the at least one relay arrangement is configured to route the data via a private connection (page 8, par. 74).

Regarding claim 18, Little discloses wherein the at least one relay arrangement is configured to route the data via a frame relay connection (page 8, par. 74).

Regarding claims 22 and 30, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement includes at least two parts, at least one of which shares a common hardware platform with the server arrangement (page 7, par. 67).

Regarding claims 23, and 28-29, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to route the data over the wireless carrier network (page 7, par. 67).

Regarding claims 25, 27, and 31, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to push the data to the at least one wireless device (page 7-8, par. 67 and page 9, par. 76-82 – wherein the wireless connector system 828

and the message server 820, both clearly protected within the firewall, are designed to cooperate and interact to allow pushing of the information to mobile devices 816, 818).

Little does not explicitly disclose wherein the first arrangement is configured to transmit the data to a particular one of the at least one wireless device only when the particular wireless device is available to receive the data.

However, Forman discloses an email server that manages, checks, and verifies the status of every email address registered in and managed by the email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claim 32, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to store the data if the at least one wireless device is not available to receive the data (page 7, par. 67).

Regarding claim 33, Little discloses the system of claim 1 wherein the data includes e-mail data (page 2, par. 24).

Regarding claims 34-35, Little discloses the system of claim 34, wherein the transport layer services include end-to-end acknowledgement of the transmission of the data to the at least one handheld wireless device (page 10, par. 88).

Regarding claim 36, Little discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the relay arrangement is configured to be under exclusive control of a single enterprise (page 7, par. 61 and 63).

Regarding claim 37, Little discloses the system of claim 1, wherein the relay arrangement is configured to be a non-shared resource with respect to other enterprises (page 7, par. 61 and 63).

Regarding claim 39, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement (i.e., wireless connector system 828) is configured to communicate with the wireless carrier network (page 7-8, par. 67).

Regarding claim 40, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to convert the data according to a data packet protocol associated with the wireless carrier network (i.e., frame relay or T1 connection using TCP/IP protocol)(page 2, par. 27 and page 8, par. 74-75).

Regarding claims 41 and 60, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to provide the data to plurality of device types over a plurality of wireless carrier network types (page 2, par. 27-28).

Regarding claim 42, Little discloses the system of claim 41, wherein at least two of the plurality of wireless carrier network types operate according to different transmission protocols (page 2, par. 27).

Regarding claims 38, 43-48, and 56, Little discloses wherein the data is routing directly to the wireless carrier network via the Internet (i.e., frame relay or T1 connection using TCP/IP protocol)(page 2, par. 22-25).

Regarding claims 49-54, Little discloses wherein the wireless carrier network is a public carrier network (page 7, par. 67).

Regarding claims 57-59, Little discloses wherein the data is routed directly to the wireless network via a dedicated connection (i.e., frame relay or T1 connection using TCP/IP protocol)(page 2, par. 22-25).

Regarding claim 61, Little discloses the system of claim 55, wherein the relay arrangement encodes the data, and pushes the data from behind the firewall arrangement to the at least one wireless device such that the data is not stored outside of the firewall arrangement while enroute to the wireless network (page 9, par. 80-82).

Regarding claim 62, Little discloses the system of claim 55, wherein the relay arrangement is configured to push the data such that intermediate processing of the data does not occur enroute to the wireless network (page 9, par. 80-82).

Regarding claim 63, Little discloses wherein the relay arrangement is configured to push the data to the at least one wireless device (page 7-8, par. 67 and page 9, par. 76-82 – wherein the wireless connector system 828 and the message server 820, both clearly protected within the firewall, are designed to cooperate and interact to allow pushing of the information to mobile devices 816, 818).

Little does not explicitly disclose that the data is not transmitted until a connection is established between the relay arrangement and the at least one wireless device, and the at least one wireless device can receive the data.

However, Forman discloses an email server system that manages, checks, and verifies the status of every email address registered in and managed by the email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claim 64, Little does not explicitly disclose that the data is not transmitted until the at least one wireless device is "on", is within a service coverage area, and is logged onto the at least one wireless network.

However, Forman discloses an email server system that manages, checks, and verifies the status of every email address registered in and managed by the

email server system before sending a message to the recipient (i.e., to make sure the recipient email address has a normal/in-office or valid status as opposed to out-of-office or invalid)(par. 31, 36, and 54-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify teachings of Little with teachings of Forman because it would allow determining the status of the recipient application before a message is sent to the recipient application as disclosed by Forman. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Forman to allow users of the email system to save time and effort by checking the status of the recipient email address before sending an email (Forman, par.13-14).

Regarding claim 65, Little discloses the system of claim 63, wherein the connection is a synchronous connection (i.e., ISDN)(page 2, par. 27).

Regarding claim 66, Little discloses the system of claim 63, wherein the connection is a secure connection (page 4, par. 39-41).

Regarding claim 67, Little discloses the system of claim 63, wherein the connection is established using a data packet protocol (page 2, par. 27).



Regarding claim 68, Little discloses the system of claim 63, wherein the connection is established using an Internet protocol (page 2, par. 27).

Regarding claim 69, Little discloses the system of claim 55, wherein the data includes enterprise data (i.e., calendars, to-do lists, (enterprise) task list, email, and documentation)(page 2, par. 24).

Regarding claim 70, Little discloses the system of claim 55, wherein the relay arrangement is co-located on the same physical device (page 7, par. 64).

Regarding claims 72-75, Little discloses the method of claim 10, further comprising:

encoding the data prior to routing the data to the at least one wireless carrier network (page 9, par. 80-82).

Regarding claims 76-80, Little discloses wherein the at least one wireless device includes a handheld wireless device (page 2, par. 22 and page 3, par. 32).

Claims 5-8 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little et al., (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0205248 and Little hereinafter), in view of Bommareddy et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,779,039 and Bommareddy hereinafter).

Teachings of Little with respect to limitation of claims 1, 10, and 14 have been discussed previously.

Regarding claims 5 and 6, Little does not expressly disclose a redundant server arrangement for the server arrangement.

However, Bommareddy discloses a redundant server arrangement for the server arrangement (col. 2, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the certificate management method and system of Little by including a redundant server arrangement for the server arrangement as disclosed by Bommareddy. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Bommareddy to improve both reliability and scalability of operations in comparison to single server operation (Bommareddy, col. 2, lines 1-10).

Regarding claims 7 and 8, Little does not expressly disclose a redundant relay arrangement for the relay arrangement.

However, Bommareddy discloses a redundant relay arrangement for the relay arrangement (i.e., clustering units wherein such redundancy may be implemented in the same or different geographic location as a design choice)(col. 5, lines 33-67 and col. 6, lines 1-30 and col. 7, lines 26-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the certificate management method and system of Little by including a redundant relay arrangement for the relay arrangement as disclosed by Bommareddy. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Bommareddy to avoid difficulties that arise with a single point of failure (Bommareddy, col. 2, lines 57-65).

Regarding claims 19-21, Little does not expressly disclose further comprising: monitoring the at least one relay arrangement including the routing of the data from the relay arrangement.

However, Bommareddy discloses further comprising: monitoring the relay arrangement including the routing of the data from the relay arrangement (col. 6, lines 30-67 and col. 7, lines 1-32).


Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the certificate management method and system of Little by including monitoring the relay arrangement including the routing of the data from the relay arrangement as disclosed by Bommareddy. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Bommareddy to improve both reliability and scalability of operations in comparison to single server operation (Bommareddy, col. 2, lines 1-10).

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arezoo Sherkat whose telephone number is (571) 272-3796. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
SYED A. ZIA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER *11/10/2007*

A.S.  
Patent Examiner  
Group 2131  
Nov. 7, 2007